arXiv:1111.4571v2 [math-ph] 4 Jul 2012

Horizons

Olaf Müller*

July 5, 2012

Abstract

We define different notions of black holes, event horizons and Killing horizons for a general time-oriented manifold (M, g) extending previous notions but without the assumption of the existence of a causal boundary for (M, g). The notions of 'horizon' are always conformally invariant while the notions of 'black hole' are genuinely geometric. Some connections between the different notions are found. Finally, we state and compare different versions of the weak cosmic censorship conjecture with precise geometric assumptions.

Studying the history of the Weak Cosmic Censorship Conjecture, one cannot help but get the impression that part of the difficulty of the problem is due to the lack of a clear formulation. Admittedly, sometimes a temporary renounce of mathematical clarity in natural sciences can help in firstly making quicker progress unhampered by mathematical subtleties not contributing much to the predictional power of the theory, and secondly developing previously unknown mathematical notions driven by purely physical intuition. But in the context of classical general relativity and in particular of the Cosmic Censorship Conjectures, it seems that many concepts could well be defined clearly in terms of differential geometry, and the only reason not to do so is that those notions diverge between different researchers. Nevertheless, this refusal to agree on a common language makes comparisons between different results significantly more tedious[1]. By providing some more or less plausible definitions of the term 'horizon' in this article, the author hopes to contribute to a more solid base for future debates between researchers in general relativity about which problems are exactly considered as the relevant ones for the purpose of physics.

The presented notions of 'horizon' will be conformally invariant, so they only depend on the causal structure and not on other geometrical data. (M, g) is always assumed to be a time-oriented Lorentzian manifold.

Definition 1 *A* **CITIF (in** M**)** *is a* C^0*-inextendible timelike future curve in* M*. We introduce an order* $<$ *of CITIFs by proper inclusion of their past, that is,* $c < k$ *if* $I^-(c) \subsetneq I^-(k)$*. A CITIF* c *is called* **non-dominant** *(resp.* **non-dominated***) iff there is no other CITIF* k *with* $c > k$ *(resp.* $c < k$*). A point* p *is called* **upper-shielded** *resp.* **lower-shielded** *iff every CITIF from* p *is non-dominated resp. non-dominant. The subset* U_M *of upper-shielded resp.* L_M *of lower-shielded*

---

*Universität Regensburg

[1] apart from the fact that the availability of commonly accepted definitions makes scientific communication much more participative than the rather feudalist 'Show-me-and-I'll-tell-you" attitude towards terminology issues

points in M is called the **upper-shielded** *resp.* **lower-shielded subset of** M*. Finally, an* **upper-shielded horizon** *resp. a* **lower-shielded horizon** *of M is the boundary of a connected component of U_M resp. L_M.*

Remark: Of course the sets L_M and U_M are future sets. Therefore, if there were a point $p \in L$ and a CITIF c from p which were dominated, then the dominating curve would have to be contained in $I^+(p)$ which is impossible as p is lower-shielded. Therefore $L_M \subset U_M$.

Recently, the definition of the causal boundary of stably causal space-times has been systematized in a comprehensive way in [3]. The causal boundary is a powerful tool e.g. for recognizing the structure of conformal embeddings of one space-time to another. However, for general time-oriented Lorentzian manifolds it does not exist. Now, we want to compare the notion of upper-shielded horizons to the usual definition of 'event horizon' in terms of the conformal boundary which is in some sense a special case of the causal boundary. Therefore, let us revise the definition of the latter. First we consider the set of all indecomposable past sets (**indecomposable** means here that the set is not the proper union of two past sets), short **IP**s. By a theorem due to Geroch, Kronheimer and Penrose ([4]), every IP is either of the form $I^-(p)$ in which case it is called **proper IP** or **PIP** for short, or else it is of the form $I^-(c)$ for c an inextendible future timelike curve c, in which case it is called a **TIP**. The set of all IPs is called $\hat{M}$, correspondingly the set of all IFs is called $\check{M}$. Let the common future C^+ resp. the common past C^- of a set X denote the set of points $C^{\pm}(X) := \{p \in M | p \in I^{\pm}(x) \ \forall x \in X\}$. Now recall that $\check{M}$ and $\hat{M}$ are subsets of the potence set of M and set $\check{M}_1 := \check{M} \cup \emptyset$ as well as $\hat{M}_1 := \hat{M} \cup \emptyset$. Then set $\tilde{M} := \check{M}_1 \times \hat{M}_1 \setminus (\emptyset, \emptyset)$. On $\tilde{M}$ we consider an equivalence relation $\sim$ defined by $P \sim F$ if and only $F \subset C^+(P)$, F maximal element w.r.t. inclusion under all indecomposable future sets in $C^+(P)$, and $P \subset C^-(F)$, P maximal element w.r.t. inclusion under all indecomposable past sets in $C^-(F)$. Finally we define $\overline{M} := \{(P,F) \in \hat{M}_1 \times \check{M}_1 | P \sim F\}$. Obviously $M \subset \overline{M}$, as $I^-(x) \sim I^+(x)$, for all $x \in M$. On this point set $\overline{M}$ one defines a chronology relation which extends the one on M: $\mathrm{chr}((P,F),(P',F')) \Leftrightarrow F \cap P' \neq \emptyset$. Now define the **naïve future null infinity** $\mathcal{J}_n^+$ as the set of non-maximal elements w.r.t. chr in the image in the quotient of the forward boundary. Clearly, this extends the notion of $\mathcal{J}^+$ as the lightlike part of the future boundary of an open conformal embedding (as used in [2] for the class of weakly asymptotically simple and empty spacetimes). Now, maximal elements are necessarily of the form $(P, \emptyset)$ as if they are of the form $(P, F \ni x)$ then we can choose some $y \in I^+(x)$ and then $\mathrm{chr}((P,F),(I^-(y),I^+(y)))$. Therefore the set of non-maximal elements can be identified with the TIPs which are pasts of non-dominant CITIFs, and we get immediately the following theorem:

Theorem 1 *Let (M,g) have a causal boundary $\mathcal{J}$. Then $U_M = L_M = M \setminus I^-(\mathcal{J}_n^+)$.* □

So, in case that there is a causal boundary of M as in [3], the definition of 'upper-shielded horizon' and 'lower-shielded horizon' coincides with the usual one $\partial(I^-(\mathcal{J}_n^+))$. On the other hand, this new notion of 'horizon' is applicable in the much wider context of general time-orientable Lorentzian manifolds. However, most physicists would probably not consider our definition of shielded horizons the correct one. As it depends only on the causal structure, it cannot take into account sufficiently what future infinity is. As an example, modify the usual conformally equivalent representation of the two-dimensional Schwarzschild space-time as a hexagonal subset of Minkowski spacetime by adding or removing a small triangle to future spacelike infinity. Then the original Schwarzschild event horizon is not a shielded horizon any more as there are CITIFS in the enclosed region which dominate other curves depending on their endpoint on the new future lightlike boundary. Still, those curves do certainly not satisfy our expectations of a curve 'escaping to infinity'. To remedy this difficulty and to distinguish a class of geodesics approaching infinity, we call a CITIF c **horizontal** iff there is no sequence c_n of CITIFs with $c_n \nearrow c$, that is, $c_n < c$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{n \to \infty} c_n = c$ where convergence of the pasts $I^-(c_n)$ is defined as final coincidence with $I^-(c)$ on every compact subset, that is, for every $K \subset M$ compact there is an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $I^-(c_i) \cap K = I^-(c) \cap K$ for all $i > m$. Then a CITIF **belongs to causal future null infinity** iff its past does not contain a horizontal CITIF. Finally, E_M is defined as the complement of the past of causal future null infinity and an **event horizon in** M as the boundary of a connected component of E_M.

One theorem wich will be important for the order relation between CITIFs is the following:

Theorem 2 *Let (M, g) be a globally hyperbolic manifold. Then from any point $p \in M$ and any point $q \in I^+(p)$ there is a CITIF c from p not intersecting $I^+(q)$ (in particular $I^-(c) \neq M$).*

Proof. We use $\emptyset \neq \partial I^+(q) \in I^+(p)$ and openness of $I^+(p)$. What we show is that for any two Cauchy surfaces S, T such that $p \in S$ and $q \in I^+(S) \cap I^-(T)$, one finds a curve c from p to T disjoint from $I^+(q)$ (the rest is induction over the level surfaces of a Cauchy time function). To this purpose, observe that $\partial I^+(q) \cap I^-(T)$ is compact, thus we can cover it by finitely many convex neighborhoods $U_1, ...U_m$. Choose an n-tuple ($q =: q_1, q_2, ...q_n \in I^+(T)$) with $q_i \in \partial I^+(T)$, $q_{i+1} \in J^+(q_i)$ and a map f from $\mathbb{N}_n$ to $\mathbb{N}_m$ with $q_i \in U_{f(i)} \cap U_{f(i+1)}$. Then we can choose $p_i \in U_{f(i)} \cap U_{f(i+1)}$ with $p_i \in I^-(q_i)$ and join them by broken geodesics. □

Led by the consideration of the hexagonal form of Kruskal space-times versus causal diamonds $D_{pq} := I^+(p) \cap I^-(q)$ in Minkowski space which are conformal to Minkowski space itself, one could think of defining horizons by the property of D_{pq} that the future of each two points intersect. This is done in the notion of 'synopticity horizon':

Definition 2 *A subset $U \subset M$ is called* **synoptic** *iff $I^+_M(p) \cap I^+_M(q) \cap U \neq \emptyset$ for each two points $p, q \in U$. A* **synopticity region** *is the complement of the closure of a* **maximal synoptic subset***, that is, of a subset $A \subset M$ which is synoptic and which is not a proper subset of a synoptic subset. Finally, a* **synopticity horizon** *is the boundary of a synopticity region.*

The definition implies directly that any synoptic subset is arcwise connected and any maximal synoptic subset of a globally hyperbolic manifold is open. The limiting case of de Sitter space-time shows two facts: Firstly, as opposed to the other notions of 'horizon' appearing in this article, maximal synoptic subsets are not unique: a spatial rotation maps one to another. Secondly, de Sitter space-time itself is not synoptic although it does not have a synopticity region due to the definition via complements of closures. On the other hand, the following theorem shows that every time-oriented Lorentzian manifold does contain a nonempty maximal synoptic subset. Consequently, it does not contain a synopticity horizon if and only if the closure of such a maximal synoptic region is all of M.

Theorem 3 *In a time-oriented Lorentzian manifold (M, g), every point $p \in M$ has a globally hyperbolic and synoptic neighborhood.*

Proof. Every diamond $I^+(x) \cap I^-(y)$ containing p and contained in a globally hyperbolic and geodesically convex neighborhood of p satisfies the condition (because every $I^-(z)$ is open and because I^- is continuous as a set-valued map). $\Box$

The relation $<$ restricted to CITIFs in a maximal synoptic subset has a maximal element:

Theorem 4 *Let U be a maximal synoptic subset, then there is a CITIF k with $I^-(k) = U$.*

Proof. Take a countable covering of U by sets of the form $I^+(y_n) \cap I^-(x_n)$ for $x_n, y_n \in U$ and choose $\underline{p_{n+1}} \in I^+(p_n) \cap I^+(x_n) \cap U$. Then join the p_n by future timelike arcs. The result is a curve k with $I^-(k) = U$. It has to be a CITIF, as every extension of it to the future could be added to the subset preserving its synopticity, which contradicts the maximality assumption. $\Box$

Theorem 5 (Hierarchy L-U-E-S of horizons) *We have the inclusions $L_M \subset U_M \subset E_M$, and for every point $p \in M \setminus L$ there is a synopticity region S with $L \subset S$ and $p \notin S$.*

Proof. We had already seen the first inclusion. For the second, let $p \in U_M$. Then, for all CITIFs c from p, there is no CITIF k with $I^-(c) \subsetneq I^-(k)$. But then $I^-(c)$ contains a horizontal CITIF, as c itself is horizontal: If c_n were a sequence with $I^-(c_n) \to I^-(c)$, $I^-(c_n) \subset I^-(c)$, then $I^-(c_m) \ni p$ for some m due to the notion of convergence, so this c_m would be a dominated CITIF from p, contradicting the assumption. For the third implication, let c be a dominating CITIF from p. Then the image of c is a synoptic subset and can therefore be extended to a maximal synoptic subset A. Because of Theorem 4, we know that $A = I^-(k)$ for some CITIF k. Now if $\emptyset \neq A \cap L \ni q$, then $k(m) \in I^+(q) \subset L$ for some $m \in \mathbb{R}$, as L is a future set. Therefore all CITIFs from $k(m)$ are non-dominant. But k itself is dominant as it dominates c (as $I^-(c) \subset I^-(k) = A$ and $q \notin I^-(c)$, again because L is a future set). $\Box$

The upper horizon is an obstruction for the synopticity of the entire space-time:

Theorem 6 *If a globally hyperbolic manifold (M, g) has a nonempty upper-shielded subset, it is not synoptic.*

Proof. We show that if (M, g) is synoptic then no point of it is upper-shielded: By Theorem 2, we know that from every point p there is a CITIF k with $I^-(k) \neq M$, so let $r_0 \in M \setminus I^-(k)$. We choose a parametrization of k by the real line such that $p = k(0)$. Then, inductively using synopticity, we choose $r_{j+1} \in I^+(k(j)) \cap I^+(r_j)$. Any maximally extended timelike future curve joining the r_i dominates k. $\Box$

Be aware of the fact that the reverse direction of the previous theorem does not hold: The de Sitter spacetime is not synoptic, but the future boundary is spacelike.

Finally, one could come up with a particularly easy horizon definition by spatial compactness:

Definition 3 *In a globally hyperbolic manifold, a subset A is called* **spatially (pre-)compact** *iff $A \cap S$ is (pre-)compact for every Cauchy surface S. A CITIF c is called* **compact** *iff $I^-(c)$ is spatially precompact. The* **compactness subset** *C_M of M is defined as the subset of all points p such that all CITIFs from p are compact, and we define a* **compactness horizon** *c_M as before as the boundary of a connected component of C_M.*

Now there is a relation between the compactness horizon and the event horizon:

Theorem 7 (Hierarchy L-U-C-E of horizons in globally hyperbolic manifolds) *In every globally hyperbolic manifold (M, g), every non-dominating CITIF is compact, and the past of every compact CITIF contains a horizontal CITIF. Thus we have the inclusions $L_M \subset U_M, C_M \subset E_M$.*

Remark. It is an easy exercise to find counterexamples to any other inclusion between C_M and any of L_M, U_M and E_M, except for $U_M \subset C_M$.

Proof. After Theorem 5 it remains to show $L_M \subset C_M \subset E_M$, which follows from the two first assertions of the theorem. To show the first, let c be a noncompact CITIF. We shall show that c is dominating. Inductively, for every Cauchy surface $S_n := t^{-1}(\{n\})$ for a Cauchy temporal function t, we choose

$$p_{n+1} \in \big(I^-(c) \cap (I^+(p_n) \cap S_n)\big) \setminus (I^+(p) \cap S_n). \tag{0.1}$$

This is well-defined, as by spatial non-precompactness of $I^-(c)$, we have that $I^-(c) \cap (I^+(p_n) \cap S_n)$ is not precompact. As $I^+(p) \cap S_n$ is compact, the right-hand side of Eq. 0.1 is nonempty. Now any future timelike curve joining the p_i is a CITIF dominated by c.

For the second inclusion, let c be a compact CITIF, then either c itself is horizontal, in which case the proof is complete. Or there is a sequence c_n of CITIFs with $c_n \nearrow c$. We define $A := \bigcap_{\{k \mathrm{CITIF}, k < c\}} I^-(k)$, this is a past set, and it is indecomposable because of minimality. Moreover, it is nonempty, as by Zorn's lemma we can write it as the intersection of a monotone chain C_n, and by compactness, for every Cauchy surface S, we get $S \cap C_n$ a mnotonous chain of compacta which is nonempty. So by the theorem of Kronheimer, Geroch and Penrose ([4]) it is the past of a CITIF, which is necessarily horizontal. $\square$

Secondly, let us now introduce a genuinely geometric, that is, not conformally invariant, notion with the same purpose of definition of future null infinity by defining *black holes*. As there is no precise and commonly accepted definition of this term, we want to take a naïve approach in which a black hole is characterized by two prominent features: it is *black and dangerous*. The first property is easily formalized as the requirement of being a future set, the second as the requirement of finite lifetime for all timelike future curves in the corresponding region.

Definition 4 *Let (M, g) be time-oriented Lorentzian. The* **black hole set** *of M is the subset BH_M of points p in M such that every future timelike curve through p has finite length.* [2]*. The black hole set BH_M is called* **strong** *iff for each point $p \in M \setminus BH_M$ there is a timelike geodesic*[3] *of infinite length from p. A* **black hole in** *M is a connected component of BH_M.*

Right from the definition, every black hole is a future set. Another advantage of this definition is the connection to incomplete geodesics which appear in the notion of singularities. There are also relations to the existence of special temporal functions as discussed in [5]. In that article, the first case in the following theorem corresponds to property M(1), and the second case to the property SMC except for the fact that a general interval is admitted as the range of the temporal function.

---

[2] alternatively, one should think about variants of this requirement: e.g., that every causal geodesic has finite lifetime, every future b.a. curve has finite future length, or requring that there is a uniform bound on these lengths.

[3] it could make sense to consider b.a.-curves instead of geodesics here.

Theorem 8 *1. If a globally hyperbolic manifold (M,g) has a temporal function t such that $g(\mathrm{grad}^{\mathrm{g}}(t), \mathrm{grad}^{\mathrm{g}}(t))$ is a bounded function on M, then it cannot contain a black hole.*

2. *If a manifold of the form $(N := I \times N, g := -\lambda^2 dt^2 + g_t)$ with I an interval, (S_0, g_0) complete Riemannian, $\dot{g}_t / g_t$ globally bounded and λ bounded from 0 and from ∞ contains a black hole, it is not synoptic.*

Proof. The first statement follows directly from the fact that in this case, the integral curves of the gradient of t are of infinite length. In the second case, I has to be an interval bounded from above, so then $pr_{S_0}(I^+(p))$ can be estimated uniformly in terms of $B_R(p)$, and one only has to choose two points in S_0 which are sufficiently far apart. $\square$

We want to establish connections between the causal notion of 'event horizon' and the geometric notion of 'black hole'. The definition corresponds to the exterior being the past of all timelike curves of infinite length. Those CITIFS could be defined as *geometric future null infinity.* It is an interesting question whether those pasts coincide with the pasts of complete *lightlike geodesics* as, traditionally, future null infinity is defined in terms of the latter. Obviously, not every event horizon bounds a black hole, as event horizons are conformally invariant and every globally hyperbolic manifold is conformally invariant to a future causally complete one (cf. [7], p. 258). More exactly we have

Theorem 9 (compare with [7]) *1. Every globally hyperbolic manifold is conformally equivalent to another one which is b.a.-complete and null geodesically complete.*

2. *For every $E > 0$, every globally hyperbolic manifold is conformally equivalent to another in which all nonspacelike curves have length smaller than E.*

Proof. We include a proof of the statement filling some minor gaps in the proof contained in the article of Seifert. First we need a Lemma which guarantees the existence of useful time functions:

Lemma 1 *Let S be a Cauchy surface in a globally hyperbolic manifold M and let $f \in C^0(S)$. Then there is a smooth Cauchy time function t on M with $t(x) > f(x)$ for all $x \in S$. In particular, as f can be chosen to be proper, there is a smooth Cauchy time function t on M with $S \cap t^{-1}((-\infty, D))$ compact for all $D \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof of the lemma. Let t_0 be a smooth Cauchy time function such that $S = t_0^{-1}(\{0\})$. Let the compact subsets $U_n \subset U_{n+1}$ cover S. We want to reach

$$t|_{U_n} \geq n. \tag{0.2}$$

We cover each $U_{n+1} \setminus U_n$ locally finitely by sets $A_i^n := I^+(p_i^n)$ such that $A_i^n \cap U_{n-1} = \emptyset$ and $A_i^n \cap (U_{n+3} \setminus U_{n+2}) = \emptyset$. Then let t_i^n be a smooth Cauchy time function on A_i^n and $\tau_i^n := exp(t_i^n)$ on A_i^n and zero on the complement of A_i^n. Then $t^n := \sum a_i^n \cdot \tau_i^n \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R})$ is a time function on an open subset containing $I^+(U_{n+1} \setminus U_n)$ and, for an appropriate choice of a_i^n, we have $t^n|_{U_{n+1} \setminus U_n} \geq n$. Finally, $t := t_0 + \sum_{i=1}^\infty$ is well-defined and smooth on M by standard arguments, it is a Cauchy time function as a sum of a Cauchy time function and a time function (recall that the latter is defined by monotonicity along future causal curves and the former additionally by surjectivity along C^0-inextendable future causal curves), and it satisfies Eq. 0.2, proving the statement.

Proof of the Theorem. Let S be a Cauchy surface in M and t a smooth Cauchy time function as in the lemma. t induces a splitting $ug = -adt^2 - ag_t^2$ of any conformal multiple ug of g. We get as geodesic equation in (M, ug) for the t coordinate along a geodesic curve c:

$$\frac{d^2t}{ds^2} = \frac{a_{,m}}{a}\frac{dx^m}{ds}\frac{dt}{ds} - \frac{\dot{a}}{2a}(\frac{dt}{ds})^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\dot{g}_{mn} + \frac{\dot{a}}{a}g_{mn})\frac{dx^m}{ds}\frac{dx^n}{ds},$$

where s is the affine parameter. With the ansatz $a = a(t)$ the first term vanishes. If we consider a b.a. curve we get a bounded real function D as an additional aditive term on the right hand side. For the geodesic case just replace D by 0 from now on. Because of compactness of the t level sets intersected with $J^+(S)$ there is an $f(t)$ with $(\dot{g}_{mn} + f(t)g_{mn})x^m x^n \geq 0$, that is to say, $\dot{g} + f(t) \cdot g$ positive definite. Now if $\frac{d(log(a(t)))}{dt} \geq max\{0, f(t)\}$ then $\frac{d^2t}{ds^2} \leq D$, but as $\frac{dt}{ds} > 0$ we get $s \geq (\frac{dt}{ds})^{-1}|_{s=0} \cdot t$ (geodesics) or $s \geq D(\frac{dt}{ds})^{-1}|_{s=0} \cdot t^2$ (b.a. curves), so in either case, for bounded s, t is bounded as well, thus $(I^+(S), a \cdot g)$ is future geodesically complete and b.a.-complete. Now choose another Cauchy hypersurface $S_0 \subset I^-(S)$ and perform the same procedure in the past direction constructing a conformal factor a_0 on $I^-(S_0)$, and finally interpolate in any manner between a_0 and a, showing the first assertion of the theorem. The second one is easier, if one uses the previous lemma one has only to choose the factor in the compact balls so that the maximum over the resulting factors before $-dt^2$ is integrable, or equivalently the lightlike affine parameter (using the compactness of lightlike directions additionally). $\square$

The question is, does the presence of an event horizon *in a Ricci flat manifold* imply the presence of a black hole? Again the answer is 'no' as it may be seen by considering the flat hexagon which is the Penrose diagram of Kruskal spacetime: It is even flat, but it is a black hole in itself, and the event horizon (which is at the same time the upper-shielded horizon, the lower-shielded horizon and the compactness horizon) does not bound a black hole. Considering the previous theorem, one can modify this example to get an one of a *timelike geodesically complete* Lorentzian manifold with the same kind of horizon by the choice of an appropriate conformal factor. Of course, Ricci-flatness is lost in this procedure. It is therefore natural to ask if this kind of 'eager-beaver censorship' can appear even if we add the requirement of Ricci-flatness. So the new question could be: *Can a Ricci-flat globally hyperbolic timelike geodesically complete Lorentzian manifold contain a horizon of some kind?*. A kind of converse question could be whether a maximally globally hyperbolic Ricci-flat manifold which is geodesically incomplete contains necessarily a horizon. This is wrong, as Taub-NUT space-time provides a counterexample - the pasts of all of its CITIFs coincide.

Finally, we introduce another notion of black holes which formalizes aspects of the Cosmic Censorship Conjecture as it appears in the 1997 Hawking vs. Preskill/Thorne bet (cf. above). We define the **future visibility subset**
$V_M^+ := \{p \in M | \forall c$ CITIFs from p and all curves h of infinite length holds $I^-(c) \not\supset h\}$
as well as the **past visibility subset**
$V_M^- := \{p \in M | \forall c$ CITIFs from p and all curves h of infinite length holds $I^-(h) \not\supset c\}$
We have always $V_M^+ \subset BH_M$, right from the definition. We show:

Theorem 10 *If (M, g) is globally hyperbolic and if there is a smooth real function f of bounded gradient on M and such that, for some bounded smooth real function a on M, $X := a \cdot \mathrm{grad} f$ is a timelike Killing vector field with $\langle X, X\rangle^{-1}$ bounded, then $V_M^+ = BH_M$.*

Remark: Compare with the situation in 2-dimensional Kruskal spacetime: Here, the Killing vector field is $X := v\partial_v - u\partial_u$ in the standard null coordinates. It is not integrable itself but pointwise proportional to $\mathrm{grad}(r)$. Still, the bounds required in the theorem do not hold.

Proof. Let $p \in BH_M$, let $c : [0, S) \to M$ be the maximal integral curve of $\mathrm{grad} f$ from p, this is a CITIF. Then $\dot{f} = \langle \dot{c}, \mathrm{grad} f\rangle = -\langle \mathrm{grad} f, \mathrm{grad} f\rangle = -\langle \dot{c}, \dot{c}\rangle$ and therefore

$\int_0^S |\dot{f}| \leq G \cdot \int_0^S \sqrt{|\dot{f}|} = G \cdot \int_0^S \sqrt{-\langle \dot{c}, \dot{c}\rangle}$

(as $\langle \mathrm{grad} f, \mathrm{grad} f\rangle$ is bounded), therefore $f \circ c$ is bounded by a real number E. Now choose a future timelike curve h of infinite length in $I^-(c)$, parametrized by arc length for simplicity. Then, as $h(n)$ is in the past of the image of c for all n, we can find a timelike geodesic curve $k_n : [0, 1]$ of length $> n$ from $h(0)$ to some point of the image of c. Then we get for the length $l(k_n)$ of k_n:

$$n < l(k_n) = \int_0^1 \sqrt{-\langle \dot{k}_n(t), \dot{k}_n(t)\rangle} dt \leq \int_0^1 \frac{|\langle \dot{k}_n(t), X(k_n(t))\rangle|}{-\langle X(k_n(t)), X(k_n(t))\rangle} dt \leq D |\langle \dot{k}_n(0), X(k_n(0))\rangle|,$$

for all natural n, where D is the bound on $|\langle X, X\rangle|^{-1}$. Here the first inequality is due to the inverse Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the second is due to the fact that the scalar product of the tangent vector of a geodesic curve with a Killing vector field is constant along the geodesic. On the other hand, we have

$$E \geq \int_0^1 \langle \dot{k}_n(t), \mathrm{grad} f(k_n(t))\rangle = \int_0^1 a^{-1} \langle \dot{k}_n(t), X(k_n(t))$$
$$= \langle \dot{k}_n(0), X(k_n(0))\rangle \int_0^1 a^{-1}(k_n(t)) dt \geq R^{-1} \langle \dot{k}_n(0), X(k_n(0)) \geq D^{-1} R^{-1} n$$

for all natural n, which is a contradiction. □

Let us list the different censorship conjectures:

Strong cosmic censorship conjecture (SCCC). Here the conjecture is that for a well-behaved field theory (that is one with a well-defined Cauchy problem in a globally hyperbolic yet fixed spacetime), the maximal Cauchy development a la Geroch and Choquet-Bruhat of the equations coupled with Einstein theory for generic compact or asymptotically flat initial values is maximal as a Lorentzian manifold (sometimes even geodesic completeness is conjectured). This conjecture is physical in nature, that means, one considers an additional field theory, although the vacuum case seems difficult enough: Christodoulou's stability result on small perturbations of initial values for the Minkowski spacetime is the only generic result in this direction. On the side of the results pointing in the inverse direction, that is, indicating that the SCCC is wrong at least in the geodesic completeness version, there is a result of Schoen and Yau in [6]. It states that for an energy-momentum tensor T such that the product between some sort of lower estimate on T on some

subset A of a Cauchy surface and some sort of diameter of A supercedes a constant real number then there will be trapped surfaces in the Cauchy development. Combined with the Penrose singularity theorem, this means that in that case either the null energy condition must be violated or else the Cauchy development cannot be null complete.
An important question in this context is if genericity could be replaced by asymptotic flatness as in the following conjecture which, to the author's knowledge, not has been confirmed or disproved yet. It is stronger as the SCCC applied to spatially asymptotically flat/vanishing initial data sets as the genericity assumption has been dropped. Still, no counterexample to it seems to be known:

Conjecture 1: *Every maximal solution of Einstein-Dirac-Maxwell theory with spatially asymptotically flat initial metric, spatially asymptotically vanishing Weingarten tensor and spatially asymptotically vanishing Dirac and Maxwell fields (latter with spatially asymptotically vanishing normal derivative) is b.a.-complete and lightlike complete.*

Note that the Christodoulou Einstein-Klein-Gordon examples exposed in [1] are self-similar, so consequently, while their metrics are initially asymptotically flat, the Klein-Gordon initial values used do not vanish towards spatial infinity.

Weak cosmic censorship conjecture (WCCC). This conjecture says that 'singularities should be hidden behind event horizons', in other words: *For a maximally globally hyperbolic manifold, incomplete timelike geodesics should not be visible 'from future null infinity' (the latter here interpreted as 'by causal curves of infinite length' or according to any choice of L_M, U_M, C_M, E_M, or S_M).* The following example shows that, without further assumptions like energy conditions, this very strong version of the conjecture is wrong:

Example 1 *Consider* $(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 | u(x), v(x) > 0\}, g_0 = dudv)$ *and the metric* $g := f \cdot g_0$ *with* $f := 1 + \psi(u) \cdot \phi(v) + \phi(u) \cdot \psi(v)$ *where* $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, [0, \infty))$ *with* $\mathrm{supp}(\phi) = [0, \infty)$ *and* $\phi(x) = x$ *for all* $x \geq 1$ *and* $\psi \in C^\infty((-\infty, 0), [0, \infty))$ *with* $\mathrm{supp}(\psi) = [-1, 0)$ *and* $\lim_{x \to 0} \psi(x) = \infty$*. Then* $(\mathbb{R}^2, g)$ *is globally hyperbolic and maximal as a Lorentzian manifold (as the gradient lines of* $u + v$ *have infinite length except for* $u = v$*), and the negative* t *axis is an incomplete geodesic contained in the past of every other inextendable future timelike curve, in particular in the past of the hyperboloids* $u \cdot v = \mathrm{const} > 0$ *which have infinite length. The scalar curvature of any such* (M, g) *(for each choice of* ϕ, ψ*) changes its sign (therefore violating the dominant energy condition, e.g.).*

The insight that without additional, physical, assumptions, in general singularities will not be hidden behind event horizons makes it appear worthwhile to merge the two (logically independent) previous conjectures to a new one as it was intended in

The 1997 bet. This is the conjecture stated by Stephen Hawking in his bet against John Preskill and Kip Thorne. It says that if a well-behaved field theory is coupled to general relativity via the classical Einstein equations, then the maximal Cauchy development from generic initial conditions cannot have a naked singularity. The latter is described as a past-incomplete null geodesic from scri-plus. As observed in several notes on this topic, it is not very clear what 'a geodesic from scri-plus' means. If it refers to a past geodesic beginning on the future null boundary, then it should at least be added that the whole geodesic lies in the future of some point p, which in turn, because of global hyperbolicity of the maximal Cauchy development, implies that the past geodesic cannot contain a point of the actual spacetime but has to stay in the ideal boundary. Therefore some authors have stated the bet in the form that the null future boundary be complete. As even the latter statement is quite ambiguous, let us take the viewpoint of the WCCC, describing a naked singularity as a maximal yet incomplete future timelike geodesic contained in the past of a complete timelike (or null) geodesic. In this sense Hawking wins the bet if either the SCCC or the WCCC is true. Considering the remark after Def 4, one relevant question in this context is certainly the following: *Are the maximal Cauchy developments of Maxwell-Einstein theory for asymptotically flat initial data SMC?*

If Conjecture 1 should not be true even in the vacuum (i.e., Ricci-flat) case, another question could decide the bet in the asymptotically flat case: *For (M, g) being a four-dimensional, Ricci-flat, globally hyperbolic, maximal (as Lorentzian manifold) and spatially asymptotically flat Lorentzian manifold, is it true that for every C^0-inextendible b.a.-curve $c : \mathbb{R} \to M$ there is an $r \in \mathbb{R}$ with $c((r, \infty)) \subset BH_M$?* If yes, any incomplete geodesic is hidden from any complete one. Note that the Taub-NUT spacetimes cannot serve as counterexamples because of the condition of spatially asymptotic flatness.

Finally, let us compare the previous notions with the ones using a Killing vector field. Recall that a (local) Killing horizon is a null hypersurface N whose tangent bundle contains $X(N)$ for some (local) Killing vector field X (around N). We will consider a narrower notion.

Definition 5 *A subset $A \subset M$ of a globally hyperbolic manifold is* **spatially bounded** *if there is a positive number R such that, for every smooth Cauchy hypersurface C, the intersection of A with C has diameter less or equal to R in the Riemannian metric of C. A subset $A \subset M$ of a globally hyperbolic manifold is* **spatially compact** *if, for some (hence any) Cauchy time function t, the intersection of A with each level set of t is compact. A* **strong Killing horizon** *is a hypersurface S in M which bounds a connected, spatially bounded future set on which a Killing field X is spacelike and also bounds a subset on which X is timelike. An* **ultrastrong Killing horizon** *is a hypersurface S in M which bounds a connected, spatially bounded and spatially compact future set on which a Killing field X is spacelike and also bounds a subset on which X is timelike.*

Obviously, in this terminology, every strong Killing horizon is the boundary of a spatially bounded set, and every ultrastrong Killing horizon is the boundary of a spatially compact and spatially bounded set. The Schwarzschild horizon is a strong Killing horizon, but it is not ultrastrong. We would like to show that every strong Killing horizon is an event horizon. Unfortunately, that is not true. A counterexample is easily found on $\mathbb{R}^2$ by the usual technique of cone ballet on the x axis: Consider coordinates (t, x) and $u := x + y, v := x - y$ and define the metric $g := \phi(x) \cdot dv(du + f(x)dv)$, for some smooth monotonously non-increasing surjective $f : \mathbb{R} \to [0, 2)$. This metric is globally hyperbolic, as its cones are narrower than the corresponding cones of Minkowski spacetime. Moreover, $X := \partial_t$ is a Killing vector field which is spacelike on the left half $L := f^{-1}((1, 2))$ of $\mathbb{R}^2$ which is a future set. And by an appropriate choice of the conformal factor ϕ, L can be made spatially bounded. But there is no shielded or event horizon in $(\mathbb{R}^2, g)$, as the past of every future timelike curve is properly contained in the past of the same curve composed with the flow of X. Moreover, the manifold is synoptic. So *the existence of a strong Killing horizon does not imply the existence of a horizon of any kind.* Still the following question remains unanswered: *Does the existence of an ultrastrong Killing horizon in a Ricci-flat maximal Lorentzian manifold* (M, g) *imply the existence of an event horizon in* M*?* In any case, the notion of Killing horizons does not seem to contribute too much to the questions around the Cosmological Censorship Conjectures.

References

[1] D. Christodoulou: *Naked singularities in self-similar spherical gravitational collapse. Phys. Rev. Lett.* 59, pp. 2137-2140 (1987)

[2] G.F.R. Ellis, S.W. Hawking: *The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time. Cambridge University Press* (1973)

[3] J. L. Flores, J. Herrera, M. Sánchez: *On the final definition of the causal boundary and its relation with the causal boundary.* To appear in *Advances in Theoretical and Mathematical Physics*

[4] R.P. Geroch, E.H. Kronheimer, R. Penrose: *Ideal points in spacetime. Proc. Roy. Soc. London A* 237, pp. 545-567 (1972)

[5] O. Müller: *Special time functions on globally hyperbolic manifolds.* Submitted to *Communications in Mathematical Physics*

[6] R. Schoen, S.-T. Yau: *The Existence of a Black Hole due to Condensation of Matter*, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 90, pp. 575-579 (1983)

[7] H.-J. Seifert: *Kausale Lorentzräume. Dissertation Hamburg* (1968)